



PADUCAH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

115 Memorial Drive • Paducah, Kentucky 42001 • (270) 554-3004 • info@pgdpcab.org • www.pgdpca.org

Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board Burial Grounds Subcommittee Meeting Minutes November 15, 2012

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Monday, November 15th at 5:45 p.m.

Board members present: Mike Kemp, Judy Clayton, Kevin Murphy, Jim Tidwell, Tom Grassham, Ben Peterson, Ken Wheeler.

U.S. Department of Energy and Contractors present: Buz Smith, Lisa Santoro, Jennifer Woodard, DOE; Bruce Ford, Jim Erickson, Kelly Layne, Fraser Johnstone, LATA; Eric Roberts, Jim Ethridge, EHI.

Burial Grounds Subcommittee Meeting

Smith provided Official Use Only training for members of the subcommittee before the meeting started.

Santoro presented information about the Burial Grounds project at PGDP. **Woodard** explained the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Act (CERCLA) process on making decisions about the Burial Grounds project. She explained that the Feasibility Study step of the investigation was the part that the CAB got involved and made recommendations. She also indicated that every five years DOE is required to re-evaluate the chosen alternative to make sure it is working like it is supposed to. Woodard added that the Burial Grounds project has been in existence since 1992, and they have been broken down into smaller, more manageable units.

Santoro said that a nonconcurrency had been issued on the Feasibility Study in January 2011, and entered an informal dispute resolution under the Federal Facility Agreement, and later was escalated to a Formal Dispute. This was resolved in February of 2012.

Clayton asked if the SWMU 4 project had started. **Santoro** indicated that it had. She also said that SWMUs 4, 5&6, 2&3, and 7&30 all fell within the five year window for consideration for work to be done through the Remedial Action Work Plan. **Woodard** added that there was verbal approval of extending the window of work on the environmental work at PGDP to 2032. She said that the different SWMU's work was staggered due to level funding over the next few years.

Kemp asked for a comparison of the different risks to the alternatives. **Woodard** said that they looked for exposure pathways and determined the risk for that exposure from the contaminate involved. **Santoro** also added that the duration of exposure was a factor in determining risk. **Kemp** asked how the risks factor into the future use of the property. **Santoro** indicated that there are institutional controls that could be put into place to restrict use.

Roberts asked if there was some idea of the height of the cap, what it is going to look like, and what the restrictions would be as far as SWMU 5&6. **Woodard** said that they were still in the Feasibility Study stage of the project. She also said that those things would be determined during the Proposed Plan stage. **Roberts** then asked where the state stood on this project. **Santoro** explained that this is what was in dispute.

Kemp asked if in the future would there be future uses that were acceptable or would the area just be off limits. **Santoro** indicated that that kind of thing is not determined in the Feasibility Study. **Woodard** added that that type of determination is not part of this FS. **Clayton** asked would that not have to work in tandem with what is being done now. **Roberts** interjected that during the following WDO subcommittee meeting, that those types of subjective concerns would be discussed. **Clayton** asked if the area would have to be fenced off. **Santoro** said that that was undetermined at this time.

Kemp asked if SWMU 6, being so small, could it not just be put into SWMU 5 and covered up if it was determined that a cap was going to be the remediation solution. **Woodard** answered by saying that part of the Feasibility Study would be to determine if it would be better to dig SWMU 6 up and dispose of it, or to extend the cap of SWMU 5 to cover 6 up also. **Kemp** said that from a CERCLA process that it might be better to just cover it up with SWMU 5. But in his opinion, from a future use viewpoint, more land would be used and potentially not be able to be used for something else in the future. **Kemp** also asked if the disposal cell would be ready in time to handle materials from SWMUs 5&6. **Woodard** indicated that the plan right now is for the disposal cell to be ready for SWMU 4 excavation.

Roberts asked what other alternatives there were if the state and EPA were aligned on their opinion and there a dispute existed. **Woodard** explained that the dispute did not have anything to do with either excavating the material opposed to putting a cap on it. **Clayton** asked when DOE would be making a decision on the Proposed Plan. **Woodard** indicated that they were very close to resolving the dispute, and the revised Proposed Plan would be coming out in February or March of 2013. **Grassham** asked if the dispute is over communications of the data to the regulators. **Woodard** explained that it was just a difference of opinion that generally ran through the whole document.

It was decided that the next subcommittee meeting would be January 17, 2013.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 pm.